

### Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 28, 2006. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

#### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 28, 2006, Claims 1-38 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) for the reason of containing reference characters not mentioned in the description. Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20, 22-35 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hilbert et al. It appears that the publication number cited in the Office Action (2003/0088580) is incorrect and upon further review, Applicant assumes the correct number to be U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088570. Therefore, Hilbert et al. will be treated by this response as Hilbert U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088570 (hereinafter Hilbert '570). Review and confirmation of the foregoing respectfully requested. Claims 7, 14, 21, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilbert '570 in view of Godlin et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0161860, hereinafter Godlin).

#### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment**

The present Response amends the Specification, amends Claims 1-9, 11-20, 22-24, 26 and 28-36, and cancels Claim 37, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-36 and 38. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

#### **III. Drawings and Specification**

In the Office Action mailed July 28, 2006, the Drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) for the reason of containing reference characters not mentioned in the description. In particular, Figure 6 reference characters 610 and 630 were cited as not having been mentioned in the description.

The present Response amends the Specification paragraphs [0046] and [0048] in order to correct various informalities. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that as amended, the Specification and Drawings comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5). Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

In the Office Action mailed July 28, 2006, Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20, 22-35 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hilbert et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088570, hereinafter Hilbert '570). It appears from the review of the cited references, that the publication number cited in the Office Action (2003/0088580) was incorrect and Applicant assumes the correct publication number to be 2003/0088570. Review and confirmation thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

*1. method for providing access to remotely stored files, the method comprising:*  
*receiving an identifier from a user to an access server;*  
*determining, by said access server, at least one login data associated with the user based on the identifier received, wherein each login data provides access to at least one of a plurality of file sources, said login data being stored on the access server;*  
*contacting by the access server each of said plurality of file sources and logging into each file source by the access server via the login data associated with each file source;*  
*retrieving, from each of said plurality of file sources, information associated with at least one file recently accessed by the user and generating a single unified list of recently accessed files from all of the plurality of file sources;*  
*generating an interface containing said unified list of recently accessed files from the plurality of file sources and presenting said interface to the user;*  
*receiving changes from the user via the interface to at least one file in the unified list of recently accessed files; and*  
*propagating said changes to one or more appropriate file sources in said plurality of file sources by said access server, said appropriate file sources containing said at least one file.*

As amended, Claim 1 defines receiving an identifier from a user to an access server wherein the access server then determines appropriate login data for that user to be used for accessing at least one of a plurality of file sources. Each of these file sources is contacted by the access server wherein the access server uses the various login data to log into the file source. Recently accessed files are then retrieved from the plurality of file sources and a single, unified list is generated by the access server, of files that were recently accessed by the user across all of the plurality of file sources. Furthermore, Claim 1 defines receiving changes from the user to the files in the unified list and propagating those changes by the access server back to the appropriate file sources from which the file was retrieved.

The advantages of the features defined in Claim 1 include, for example, the ability to draw a single list of the most recently created, modified or accessed files across a variety of multiple heterogenous file sources. The access server can provide a solution that allows users easy and secure access to files located throughout different locations.

Hilbert '570 teaches systems and methods for operating a multi-user document device via a personal device portal. More particularly, Hilbert '570 appears to disclose inputting user identity into a device portal and associating the identity of the user with a user id device (par. [0063]). Hilbert '570 also discloses using the user identification device to verify the user and accessing a personal portal with the user based on the verified identity of the user (par. [0033]). Furthermore, Hilbert '570 appears to disclose personalizing a personal portal based on the identity of the user by providing access to personal resources which may include recent documents (par. [0070]-[0071]). However, Applicant respectfully submits that this is not the same as the features defined in Claim 1.

Firstly, Hilbert '570 fails to disclose an access server that receives an identifier, determines at least one login data for a user and automatically logs into each of a plurality of file sources by using the appropriate login data in order to retrieve files for the user, as defined in Claim 1. No such access server functionality appears to be disclosed in the cited reference. Instead, Hilbert '570 merely appears to teach identifying the user and accessing a portal based on the verified user identity. There does not appear to be disclosed any determining of login data for each of a plurality

of file sources, nor that the access server contacts each of those file sources in order to retrieve the files, as defined in Claim 1.

Secondly, Hilbert '570 fails to disclose generating, by the access server, a single unified list of recently accessed files from all of the plurality of file sources, as defined in Claim 1. Hilbert '570 does not appear to disclose drawing such a single list of files across a plurality of multiple file sources, as defined in Claim 1. Instead, Hilbert '570 merely appears to provide the multi-user document device with access to personal resources. While these personal sources may contain recent documents (Hilbert '570, par. [0071]), there appears to be no disclosure of generating a unified list of recently accessed files across multiple file sources, as defined in Claim 1.

Thirdly, Hilbert '570 fails to disclose receiving changes from the user via the interface to at least one file in the unified list of recently accessed files and propagating those changes back to the appropriate file sources by the access server, as defined in Claim 1. Hilbert '570 does not appear to disclose or be concerned with any such functionality. Godlin also fails to disclose these features. Godlin was cited as teaching a cache where "if the latest version is in the cache, the client will utilize the version stored in the cache. If there is a more recent version on the server... the server sends and the client receives the delta... between the latest version and the ... cached." (Godlin par. [0147]). The client then appears to "reconstruct the latest version of the requested file" by applying the diff. (par. [0147]). However, Applicant respectfully submits that this is not the same as the features defined in Claim 1.

For example, in Claim 1, the changes to files in the unified list are received from the user. Subsequently, these changes are propagated back to the appropriate file sources that contain the sources. As such, this feature of Claim 1 is different from updating the cache in view of the more recent version on the server, which is what appears to be taught in Godlin. As defined in Claim 1, the local changes made via the interface are propagated back to the plurality of file sources from which the list was originally generated. Godlin does not appear to be at all concerned with such a feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 8, 15, 22, 26 and 32**

Claims 8, 15, 22, 26 and 32 have been amended similarly to Claim 1 to more clearly define the embodiments therein. As amended, Claims 8, 15, 22, 26 and 32 contain at least some of the features discussed above in regards to Claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments and remarks made above in connection with Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8, 15, 22, 26 and 32 as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 2-6, 9-13, 16-20, 23-25, 27-31, 33-35 and 38**

Claims 2-6, 9-13, 16-20, 23-25, 27-31, 33-35 and 38 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-6, 9-13, 16-20, 23-25, 27-31, 33-35 and 38 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action mailed July 28, 2006, Claims 7, 14, 21, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilbert in view of Godlin et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0161860, hereinafter Godlin).

**Claims 7, 14, 21, 36 and 37**

Claim 37 has been canceled, rendering any rejection moot as to that claim. Claims 7, 14, 21 and 36 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7, 14, 21 and 36 are similarly neither

anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

#### VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including November 28, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 13, 2006

By: /Justas Geringson/

Justas Geringson  
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800